

Reply to Office Action dated March 2, 2010

**Amendments to the Specification**

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 1, line 5, with the following new paragraphs:

**FIELD OF THE INVENTION**

The invention relates to a charge intercooler for a motor vehicle ~~according to the precharacterizing clause of patent claim 1.~~

**BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION**

Please insert the following new paragraph at page 2, line 19:

**SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION**

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 2, line 26, with the following new paragraph:

~~This object is achieved by the features of patent claim 1.~~—According to the invention, it is provided that, for the reduced cooling, a certain number of tubes of the charge intercooler is shut off, i.e. the charge air is prevented from flowing through these tubes. Accordingly, for example, only 10 percent to 30 percent of the tubes have charge air flowing through them, which results in a lesser cooling of the emerging charge air. The advantage achieved by this is that—even in the--case of unfavorable outside conditions, for example low outside temperatures—an increased exhaust gas temperature required for filter regeneration or a particulate burn-off is obtained.

Reply to Office Action dated March 2, 2010

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 6, line 4, with the following new paragraph:

~~The object of the invention is furthermore achieved by the features of patent claim 20 which constitutes a parallel solution to patent claim 1.~~ The charge intercooler has air flowing through it in a U-shaped manner, i.e. twice and, on one side, has a charge air box with an entry and exit opening and a partition and, on the other side, a deflecting box. A shut-off member preferably a round pivoting flap, is arranged in the partition. The advantage of a reduced charge air cooling when the flap is open is therefore likewise achieved because a considerable portion of the charge air flowing in passes directly, i.e. without cooling, into the outlet. The advantage of this solution is above all the fact that the shut-off member in the partition is constructively relative simple to control and is therefore associated only with a little additional outlay.

Please add the following new paragraph at page 6, line 21:

#### BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

Please add the following new paragraph at page 7, line 20:

#### DETAILED DESCRIPTION